

- 10 -

REMARKS

Regarding claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Sekendur does not disclose the claimed features as suggested by Examiner.

Sekendur is solely concerned with determining the position (and in some cases, rotation) of a sensing device relative to a surface that includes coded data. As acknowledged by Examiner, this is in the form of detecting data that encodes X-Y coordinates.

However, the present invention requires that the coded data "includes data indicative of a functional attribute of a part of the region". Sekendur discloses no such functionality.

To begin with, Sekendur does not disclose data indicative of a "functional attribute". There is nothing "functional" about X-Y coordinates – they merely represent data that is indicative of a relative location. What "functional attribute" does Examiner contend is disclosed by the use of X-Y coordinates in Sekendur?

Moreover, the information encoded in the data of Sekendur is not related in any way to the region in which it is encoded. Data only encodes an X-Y position, which is indicative only of the position of the data (in the form of tags), and not of a "region". Even if one stretches the disclosure of coordinate data in Sekendur to amount to disclose a region (being the region of the coordinate), Sekendur still fails to disclose that the region has a functional attribute associated with it, and that the coded data is indicative of that function. In what way is the coded data in Sekendur indicative of a functional attribute of a region?

This position is further supported by the fact that claim 3 defines the additional feature of the coded data also being indicative of a location. Claim 3 makes it clear that the concept of location, as disclosed in Sekendur, is distinct from the "functional attribute of a part of a region" defined in claim 1. On this basis alone, it is submitted that the feature of claim 1 is logically distinct from the disclosure of Sekendur on the basis that claim 3 makes it even more explicit that the term "functional attribute" in claim 1 excludes location information such as coordinates.

- 11 -

Regarding claim 2-14, can Examiner please explain why no attempt has been made to provide a link between the disclosure of Sekendur and the claimed features? For example, claim 2 adds that the functional attribute is any of a number of particular features, none of which is disclosed in Sekendur. Why has Examiner not made any attempt to show how Sekendur is relevant to this claim.

Similarly, claim 3 requires that the coded data be indicative of both a functional attribute associated with a region (via claim 1) and of a location. Sekendur is utterly silent on this point.

Claims 4 to 7 disclose other combinations of features that Sekendur is utterly silent on. In the absence of even a prima facie case from Examiner, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of these claims is improper, and should either be withdrawn or supported by reference to suitable parts of Sekendur.

Similar comments apply in relation to method claims 8 to 14.

Regarding the sensing device of claim 15, the comments in relation to earlier claim also apply. Additionally, Applicant submits that in the absence of the coded data of Sekendur having "functional attributes" associated with "a part of a region", it is logically impossible that the sensing device of Sekendur can react to such a feature. On this basis alone it is submitted that claim 15 is allowable over the cited art.

Regarding claim 16, Examiner's conclusion regarding handwriting recognition is, with respect, not relevant to the claimed features. The claim requires that the sensing device provide an indication to a user when it senses data indicative of a functional attribute. In contrast, the handwriting recognition feature mentioned by Examiner is not related to sensing a functional attribute of coded data, but instead is about determining a path of the sensing device over time with reference to the coded data then comparing that data with pre-captured handwriting data. There is no way that the language of claim 16 can be understood

- 12 -

in such a way as to include the handwriting recognition system of Sekendur. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 16 is allowable over the cited art.

Regarding claim 17, Examiner is again, with respect, confusing the cause of the indication. The claim requires that the indication be provided in response to the device sensing a functional attribute of the coded data. The examples from Sekendur provided by Examiner have nothing to do with sensing such functional attributes. Rather, the feedback happens when the location data is translated into path data, and the path data is compared to signature data. The indication is therefore based on processed determination based on a path rather than being based on the sensing of a functional attribute of coded data, where the attribute is related to the region as defined in the claims. On this basis it is respectfully submitted that claim 17 is allowable over the cited art.

Similar comments apply in relation to claim 18. Again, the data sensed in Sekendur in no way includes data indicative of a functional attribute of a part of a region within which the coded data is disposed.

The comments above apply in relation to system claims 19 and 20.

- 13 -

CONCLUSION

Further consideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,



PAUL LAPSTUN



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia
Email: Kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9818 6711